REMARKS

Applicants present this Amendment and Response to address the Office Action having a mailing date of December 23, 2008. Claims 1, 3, 5-8, 13, 23, 25, 26, 28, 30, and 31 have been amended without intending to abandon or to dedicate to the public any patentable subject matter. Accordingly, claims 1-31 are pending.

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for his indication that claims 5-7 and 13 are allowable but for their dependence from a rejected independent claim. Claims 5, 6, and 13 have been amended into independent form. Claim 7 is dependent from allowable claim 6. Accordingly, claims 5-7 and 13 appear to be in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-4, 8-12, and 14-31 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0010780 to Garvin [hereinafter "Garvin"]. In order for a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) to be proper, each and every claim element must be found either expressly or inherently in a single prior art reference. (MPEP § 2131). Applicants respectfully submit that Garvin fails to teach several aspects of the independent claims and respectfully request that the rejection of the pending claims be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Garvin is generally directed toward a fuzzy parser that processes source code files received from a single source code source. The fuzzy parser is allowed to trade absolute accuracy for robustness and speed, thereby permitting the fuzzy parser to be particularly useful in very large bodies of software. It is clearly seen in Fig. 1 of Garvin that the source code files 9 which are ultimately parsed by a number of different intermediate files 13 is received from a single source code source 8. *See* Garvin ¶¶ 36-51.

The present invention, on the other hand, provides a meta-parser and methods of using such a meta-parser that are adapted to receive and process data input streams from multiple telecommunication components, which may or may not provide telecommunication data input streams in similar formats. Accordingly, the present invention is able to robustly parse an input stream that possibly has different input structures. This is contrasted to the system of Garvin that parses source code from a single source.

Accordingly, the pending claims are allowable.

The dependent claims provide further reasons for allowance.

As an example, dependent claims 3, 11, 24, and 25 provide that the input stream may comprise headers, which may correspond to nonstandardized headers. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's assertion that Garvin teaches the use of headers as is contemplated by embodiments of the present invention.

As another example, claims 12, 20, 24, and 29 provide details related to the use of a token in connection with the input stream. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's assertion that Garvin teaches the use of tokens as is contemplated by embodiments of the present invention.

Based on the foregoing, Applicants believe that all pending claims are in condition for allowance and such disposition is respectfully requested. In the event that a telephone conversation would further prosecution and/or expedite allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

SHERIDAN ROSS P.C.

Date: March 20, 2009

By: /Matthew R. Ellsworth/
Matthew R. Ellsworth
Reg. No. 56,345
1560 Broadway, Suite 1200
Denver, Colorado 80202
Telephone: 303-863-9700